REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the final Office Action mailed on May 6, 2010. Claims 1-4 and 7-10 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to include features of claim 2 and is further supported, for example, in Fig. 9. The amendments to claim 2 are supported, for example in Figs. 8 and 9. Claim 3 is amended to depend from claim 1. Claims 4 and 7 are amended editorially. The amendments to claim 6 are supported, for example, in Figs. 12A and 12B. Claim 8 is amended to depend from claim 1 and is further amended editorially. The amendments to claims 9 and 10 are supported, for example, in Figs. 17, 19 and 20. Claims 14-18 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 21 and 22 are new and are supported, for example, in the specification on page 31, lines 9-22. No new matter is added. Claims 1-11, 21 and 22 are pending.

§103 Rejections:

Claims 1-8 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lewis (US Patent No. 6,773,671) in view of Kermani (US Publication No. 2003/0098233). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to an information recognizing analyzer that recites, among other features, that at least one of the first and second electrodes is connected to an elastic member provided separately from the first and second electrodes, the first end second electrodes being spaced from each other via the elastic member. Claim 1 also recites that the information recognizer includes an electro-physical-quantity variable part that has different electro-physical quantities in accordance with the information added to the analyzing article, upon attachment of the analyzing article, and the electro-physical-quantity variable part comprises a variable capacitor.

The combination of Lewis and Kermani does not teach or suggest these features of claim 1. First, the combination of Lewis and Kermani does not teach or suggest that at least one of the first and second electrodes is connected to an elastic member provided separately from the first and second electrodes. The rejection of claim 2 interprets the flexible pins 540 and the static pins 580 of Lewis as the first and second electrodes of the electro-physical-quantity variable part. However, nowhere does Lewis teach or suggest that at least one of the flexible pins 540 or the static pins 580 are connected to an elastic

member provided separately from the flexible pins 540 and the static pins 580. Thus, nowhere does Lewis teach or suggest that at least one of the first and second electrodes is connected to an elastic member provided separately from the first and second electrodes, the first end second electrodes being spaced from each other via the elastic member, as recited in claim 1.

Kermani is provided for teaching that capacitance and resistance measurements can be derived from current measures, and does not overcome these deficiencies of Lewis.

Also, the combination of Lewis and Kermani does not teach or suggest that the information recognizer includes an electro-physical-quantity variable part which has different electro-physical quantities in accordance with the information added to the analyzing article, upon attachment of the analyzing article, and the electro-physical-quantity variable part comprises a variable capacitor. The rejection asserts that paragraph [0082] of Kermani teaches that capacitance and resistance measurements can be derived from current measures. However, Kermani is silent as to a detecting a capacitance variation of a variable capacitor for determining information added to an analyzing article. That is, nowhere does Kermani teach or suggest that the information recognizer includes an electro-physical-quantity variable part which has different electro-physical quantities in accordance with the information added to the analyzing article, upon attachment of the analyzing article, the electro-physical-quantity variable part comprising a variable capacitor.

For at least these reasons claim 1 is not suggested by the combination of Lewis and Kermani and should be allowed. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claims 9-11 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Kermani and further in view of Eilersen (US Patent No. 4,175,428). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 9 is directed to an information recognizing analyzer that recites, among other features, an electro-physical-quantity variable part that includes a pair of electrodes and a pressure sensitive electric conductor sandwiched between the pair of electrodes.

The combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen does not teach or suggest these features. As noted in the rejection, neither Lewis nor Kermani teaches a pressure sensitive electric conductor. The rejection notes that column 1, lines 34-33 of Eilersen teaches a capacitive dynamometer comprising an elastic body that will deform, i.e., change volume, upon application of a mechanical force, wherein the change in volume will change the capacitance. However, nowhere does Eilersen teach or suggest a capacitive dynamometer sandwiched between a pair of electrodes. Thus, Eilersen also does not teach or suggest an electro-physical-quantity variable part that includes a pair of electrodes and a pressure sensitive electric conductor sandwiched between the pair of electrodes, as recited in claim 9.

For at least these reasons claim 9 is not suggested by the combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen and should be allowed. Claim 11 depends from claim 9 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

Claim 10 is directed to an information recognizing analyzer that recites, among other features, an electro-physical-quantity variable part that includes a plurality of pairs of electrodes and a plurality of pressure sensitive electric conductors each sandwiched between a respective pair of electrodes.

The combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen does not teach or suggest these features. As noted above, the combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen fails to teach an electro-physical-quantity variable part that includes a pair of electrodes and a pressure sensitive electric conductor sandwiched between the pair of electrodes. Accordingly, the combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen also fail to teach or suggest an electro-physical-quantity variable part that includes a plurality of pairs of electrodes and a plurality of pressure sensitive electric conductors each sandwiched between a respective pair of electrodes, as recited in claim 10.

For at least these reasons claim 10 is not suggested by the combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen and should be allowed.

New Claims:

In order to expedite the prosecution of this matter, the following is noted with respect to new claims 21 and 22.

Claim 21 depends from claim 9 and recites that the pressure sensitive conductor includes electrically conductive particles dispersed in an elastically compressible material. Claim 22 depends from claim 10 and recites that each of the pressure sensitive conductors includes electrically conductive particles dispersed in an elastically compressible material.

As noted in the present Office Action, neither Lewis nor Kermani teach or suggest a pressure sensitive conductor. Also, while the present Office Action relies on column 1, lines 34-33 of Eilersen as teaching a pressure sensitive conductor, nowhere does Eilersen teach or suggest that its capacitive dynamometer includes electrically conductive particles dispersed in an elastically compressible material.

For at least these reasons claims 21 and 22 are not suggested by the combination of Lewis, Kermani and Eilersen and should be allowed.

Conclusion:

Applicants respectfully assert that pending claims are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.

Dated: October 6, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: _____
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/ahk